REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 10-12 are all the claims pending in the application, including new claims 10-12.

Claims 1-4 have been rejected on two bases, §102(e)-anticipation and double patenting. Claims 5-6 are objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten as independent claims that encompass the restrictions set forth in the claims from which they are dependent.

The Examiner cites Kinjo (US 6,219,129), as the reference that allegedly anticipates claims 1-4 of the present invention. Kinjo is also cited in the double patenting rejecting in combination with Yamazaki (US 6,639,690).

Claims 5 and 6 are rewritten in independent form as suggested by the Examiner to place claims 5 and 6 in form for allowance.

With respect to claim 1, Applicant amends the claim to add an additional limitation of an instruction unit for instructing that the result of the search performed by said search unit is proper or improper. Applicant submits that the prior art fails to teach or suggest this feature of the claims, and thus claims 1-4 are allowable.

With further regard to claim 4, Applicant submits that Kinjo does not teach or suggest the limitations of this claim. Here, the Examiner points to col. 5, lines 58 to 61, col. 18, lines 21 to 34, and col. 23, lines 54 to 56 of the reference. However, Applicant submits that none of the cited excerpts disclose the recited feature of claim 4 that the display unit represents the result of the search together with the output image obtained by reprocessing the input image." Thus, claim 4 is allowable for this additional reason.

For the double patenting rejection, Applicant submits that claims 1-4 are allowable over the Yamazaki/Kinjo combination, because neither of the references teaches or suggests the feature of amended claim 1 of an instruction unit for instructing that the result of the search performed by said search unit is proper or improper.

New claims 10-12 are added to further define the present invention, and are believed to be allowable over the prior art at least because of their dependence from claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Cameron W. Beddard
Registration No. 46,545

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 2, 2004